

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this case. All pending claims have been rejected. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12 have been amended and claims 2 and 11 have been cancelled.

The specification has been amended as required according to paragraph 3 of the Office Action.

Claim 3 has been amended to change a multiple dependency from claims 1 and 2 into a single dependency on claim 1 since claim 2 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added to claim 3.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,283,904 to Carson et al. Claims 2, 6, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carson et al in view of US Patent no. 4,807,116 to Katzman et al. The rejection of these claims under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12 have all been amended to recite a single packet type bit for distinguishing between a request and a response packet. No new matter has been inserted into claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12. Support for the amendment to claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12, is found, for example, in FIG. 4 and in paragraph [0033] of the specification, which is reproduced below:

[0033] The opcode field 74 of a request packet has a number of different possible encodings to define the nature of the requested access. Bit 7 of the opcode is used to identify whether it is a request or a response packet however. With bit 7 set to one, the packet is a response and which bit 7 set to zero, the packet is a request. The opcode field 85 of the response packet thus has bit 7

set to one in each case. In addition, bit 0 is set to zero if the response is a ordinary response (successful transaction), and is set to one if it is an error response. Thus, the opcode field can quickly and readily identify whether a packet is a request or a response and whether the response is an ordinary response or an error response.

Note that paragraph [0033] points out the important performance advantages associated with the existence of a single packet type bit.

In contrast, the secondary reference to Katzman et al does not teach or fairly suggest the existence of a single packet type bit for quickly distinguishing between a request or a response packet as claimed. In particular, the Examiner-designated SND REQ and SND ACK signals shown in FIG. 9 of Katzman et al teach multi-clock signal waveforms that differ markedly from the single packet type bit as claimed and taught in the present invention.

There are no teachings or suggestion of a single packet type bit for quickly distinguishing between a response packet and a request packet as claimed in the primary Carson et al reference.

Thus, claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12 as amended are deemed to distinguish over either Carson et al or Katzman et al, or in their hypothetical combination, and these claims are deemed to be allowable under 35 USC 103(a).

Claims 5, 8, 15, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carson et al in view of Katzman et al, and further in view of US Patent No. 5,704,034 to Circello. The rejection of claims 5, 8, 15, 18 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully traversed, as these claims are deemed to be allowable from depending upon an allowable base claim as amended.


Attorney Docket No. 99-TK-553SS
Client Matter No. 80408.0081
Express Mail No.: EV331754242US
Serial No: 09/410,974

For the reasons given above, all pending claims 1, 3-10 and 12-20 are deemed to be allowable and the case is deemed to be in condition for allowance.

No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

10/6, 2003


Peter J. Meza, No. 32,920
Hogan & Harrison LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(719) 448-5906 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax